LABOUR MONTHLY

Founded 1921 Editor: R. Palme Dutt

NATIONALISATION BETRAYED?

by

Will Paynter

*

Also:

R.P.D.: 'Whither Europe?'

R. Page Arnot: 'These United States'

Peter Nicholas: 'Motor Workers and Common Market'

and

Conference reports by Delegates: *Farmworkers*, *Engineers*, and *Scottish T.U.C.*

JUNE 1962

One Shilling and Sixpence

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NO THROWING LIFE AWAY

'TO DO NOTHING but grumble and not to act—that is throwing one's life away.' It is that conviction, which William Morris expressed so well, which brings demonstrations and protests, great and small; from May Day parades and peace marches scores of thousands strong to a few people on the kerb making a peace or pay point with posters; from freedom-riders defeating Jim Crow in the Southern United States to women strolling through a square in Madrid in silent solidarity with Asturian miners, brave sons of brave fathers who never lived on their knees. It is the rejection of patient sufferance, the assertion that whilst the heart beats the hand can strike, that makes one warm to what William Morris wrote an old friend, the wife of the artist Burne-Jones. It was in the summer of 1881, at a time when every day Morris was finding something new to despise and hate in the society he lived in—whether war, colonialism or the social conditions of capitalist exploitation of man and woman for the profit of others. Like many today, he was still feeling his way toward the immensely full political life he lived later; Mrs. Burne-Jones had been arguing that action was useless, that he should not keep complaining, even amongst his friends, about 'the follies and ills that oppress the world at large'. (Perhaps she hinted he was in danger of 'becoming a bore' to them.) Morris replied: 'You see, it is but now and then that one has a chance of speaking about the thing in public, and meantime one's heart is hot with it, and some expression of it is like to quicken the flame even in those one loves and respects most, and it is good to feel the air laden with the coming storm even as we go about our daily work or while away time in light matters. To do nothing but grumble and not to act—that is throwing away one's life: but I don't think that words on our cause that we have at heart do nothing but wound the air, even when spoken among friends: 'tis at worst like the music to which men go to battle.'

Now everywhere in the world, not least in Britain. each day new people are beginning to hear the beat of the music. They begin to reject the sick comments of the cynic who stands on the sidelines, thanking his star there is no cause that can stir *him* into action. They can no longer bear to throw away their life without taking action, no matter what their neighbours will do. I was listening to an argument with a young fellow a couple of weeks back; he was depressed, and had sought us out to say how useless every action seemed. that your workmates would not support you, that it was each man for himself in his factory. Yet the next day out of the neighbouring factory came a petition, crumpled and dirty, bearing close on a hundred signatures, supporting—not their own demands but the nurses' pay claim. That was due to one man's initiative (a reader, by the way), who saw no reason—and sought no reason—to hang back. I don't need to tell you which man wore the cheerful grin. Similarly, a *Londoner* writes describing what many thousands must have felt at Easter: 'I was elated by many aspects of the Aldermaston March, not least at the way many young people are arguing fiercely about our present society, and questioning many of the standard attitudes of the main political parties, and looking far beyond the aims of the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament merely. I came away

(Continued on page iii of cover)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes of the Month

WHITHER EUROPE?

Dr. Adenauer said that he did not lay the blame for this feeling of appeasement at the feet of the British Government, but of the British people.

(*The Times*, January 9, 1962.)

WHAT next in Europe? In East-West relations in Europe? In the future of Germany? In the relations of Britain and the Six? In the rôle of the United States in Europe? Mr. Macmillan originally applied his 'winds of change' to Africa, and later to Asia. He had better apply it to Europe. The rigid pattern of cold war immobility and of the American satellite empire in Western Europe, set and maintained through a variety of forms for the past decade and a half (Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan, Nato, O.E.E.C., nuclear bases and military occupation, partition of Germany to create the West German state of the Hitlerite monopolists and generals) has begun to show certain cracks and strains. Not yet definite changes. But hints of changes and impending new events. Will the present American-Soviet negotiations over West Berlin lead to some provisional partial settlement in relation to West Berlin and Germany, such as may at any rate diminish the present tension and open the way to further advance? There are some favourable indications of such a possibility.

CONTENTS

VOL. XLIV JUNE · 1962

	Page
NOTES OF THE MONTH: *Whither Europe?* by R.P.D.	241
NATIONALISATION BETRAYED? by W. Paynter	255
HALT THE ARMS RACE, by E. H. S. Burhop	260
THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S CONGRESS: *Document of the Month*	262
ILLUSTRATION	263
MOTOR WORKERS AND THE COMMON MARKET, by Peter Nicholas	265
AFTER THE BALLOT, by Dick Etheridge	268
DELEGATES AT CONFERENCE: 1. *The Farmworkers*, by J. Maynard, J.P.; 2. *The S.T.U.C.*, by an English Delegate; 3. *The Engineers*, by a Delegate ...	270
THESE UNITED STATES, by Robin Page Arnot	277
CUBA TRAVEL NOTES (4. *Education*), by D. N. Pritt, Q.C. ...	282
Book Reviews:	
Education and the Working Class, by Brian Jackson and Dennis Marsden: *Brian Simon;* An Atlas of African Affairs, by Boyd and Van Rensburg: *Kay Beauchamp* ...	287

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Certainly the fury of Adenauer might suggest this. Will the new Adenauer-De Gaulle Axis mix cold war rigidity with a certain anti-American and anti-British tinge? But how long will Adenauer last in West Germany? What will follow him? Or De Gaulle in France?

Britain and the World

Britain under Macmillan's supine leadership, the football of these conflicts of the other powers, was first snubbed and kicked by Kennedy to join the Common Market in order to be stripped of the Commonwealth; then humbly applying to join it after having vainly tried to fight it through the Seven, is Britain now finally to be spurned and humiliated to abject alternatives of capitulation or exclusion by the Common Market under Adenauer and de Gaulle? With Gaitskell mumbling 'Yes, sir', 'Certainly, sir', 'As You Say, Sir' at each new turn of the wheel and successive somersault? There is no doubt that Britain's whole future in the world is now on the anvil. Never was there such an opportunity for the Labour Party, if it had the leadership, to take over the running from the discredited Tories and respond to the feeling of the people by fighting in the forefront for an independent policy for Britain, independent alike of the domination of the United States or of Adenauer, in the interests of peace and disarmament. Failure to take advantage of these opportunities of leadership has frustrated the anti-Tory revolt, diverted it into the channels of the spurious alternative of the Liberal Party, and created unseemly disruption and division between the official Labour Party and the peace movement. It is in relation to this key question of Britain's rôle in the present world situation that the new trends now appearing on the international horizon need to be judged.

Europe and South-East Asia

It would be a mistake to regard the new trends as constituting a firm pattern. The governing cold war mould, with all its harmful consequences, is still unbroken. The internal political situation inside Western Germany, as in all the Western European countries in different forms (including Spain and Portugal) has become markedly unstable. Across the shoulder of the ageing Adenauer breathe Mende, Schroeder, Erhardt, Dehler, not to mention Brandt, with an assorted variety of rival policies. De Gaulle has been confronted with the resignation of his five best known Ministers. Nor

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does the present trend of international policy of the United States present a uniform picture. President Kennedy's more conciliatory moves, through the Rusk-Gromyko exchanges, towards a possible negotiated settlement over West Berlin and some of the questions of Germany, have been accompanied by, and are possibly the counterpart of the new reckless offensive and open war operations in South-East Asia. General Clay has been withdrawn from his provocations in West Berlin. But General Harkins has been placed in command of the total military, naval and air forces now being massed in South-East Asia. The bellicose Ambassador Grewe has been sent packing as 'incompatible' with American policy. But Defence Secretary Macnamara has been dispatched to South-East Asia to sound the most strident war calls. Five thousand American troops have been engaged in open war against the people of South Vietnam, and thousands more, with planes and warships, have been deployed to threaten the peoples of Thailand and of Laos. Yet a peaceful settlement could be reached here tomorrow if the system of invading countries thousands of miles from the United States and maintaining corrupt anti-popular gangster régimes by dollars and arms could be abandoned in favour of allowing the peoples themselves freedom to choose their own régime and government.

Nuclear Tests

Similarly the nuclear arms race has been intensified by the current series of American nuclear tests in the Pacific. According to American official statements these tests, which in the absence of a test ban, are expected to give rise to a consequent series of Soviet tests, have not been necessitated by any requirement to 'catch up' with the Soviet Union after the preceding series of Soviet tests, since American superiority is still claimed, and the number of Soviet tests has been less than half the Western number. On May 2 this year, Mr. Heath in parliament gave the figures up to that date as totalling 'about 100' for the Soviet Union and 221 for the West (United States, 195; Britain, 22; France, 4). Even a Soviet renewal would still leave the Western total very much higher. With regard to fall-out there seem to be indications of less concern over the dangers with regard to this series over the Pacific than there was over the Soviet series:

> The Russians exploded something well in excess of 100 megatons in 28 tests in September and October. Yet measurements of strontium taken are now almost identical with those recorded in the spring of 1959 after

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> a series little more than half this size. Such figures are well below danger level, indeed they are almost insignificant. In which case, why does the Government not disclose them? Can it believe the public's memory is so short that it forgets the scare of six months ago with its warnings about strontium in springtime? . . . One can only conclude that just now the desire prevails to avoid the whole subject as too sensitive.
>
> (*The Economist*, April 28, 1962.)

Evidently 'circumstances alter cases'.

Why No Test Ban?

Every decent person, irrespective of nationality or political outlook, would like to see a nuclear test ban to hold up at any rate the further intensification of the nuclear arms race, pending advance on the main question of disarmament which so far is blocked (only the Soviet Union has up to the present put forward a draft treaty for disarmament). The Soviet Union has declared its readiness to sign a nuclear test ban treaty. The United States opposes such a treaty, unless the existing entirely adequate detection machinery, which in practice has detected all explosions of any significance, is supplemented by 'on the spot inspections' on Soviet soil. The alleged justification for this demand is that otherwise smaller underground explosions cannot be distinguished from recordings caused by earthquake tremors. This claim has been discounted by leading scientists of all countries, including the United States. Speaking with unquestioned authority, the Director of the Kurchatov Institute of Atomic Energy, A. Alexandrov, in a statement in the Supreme Soviet on April 25, said:

> Experiments held to date have shown that it is possible to detect underground nuclear explosions at any point in the globe with the existing national equipment. Moreover, a nuclear explosion can be distinguished from an earthquake or any other type of interference with a high degree of reliability.

After a technical explanation of the difference in the recording, he concluded:

> Owing to this difference, seismographic observations make it possible to distinguish an earthquake from an explosion with adequate accuracy.

The real aim of aggressive nuclear strategy concealed in this demand for 'on the spot inspections' inside the Soviet Union, as with the previous U-2 incursions, has been exposed by Professor Blackett (quoted in these Notes in April).

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contradictions of American Policy

Even the Conservative *Daily Telegraph* found itself compelled to throw a doubt on the bona fides of the American alleged grounds for obstructing a test ban treaty, when, after the neutral compromise proposals had brought in view the danger of an agreement, the American spokesmen produced the peculiar new demand for rights of inspection teams on Soviet soil to search for any possible 'preparations' for a nuclear explosion. On this the Conservative organ (less easily satisfied than Mr. Gaitskell) commented:

> No one at present has any idea how a requirement of this kind could be operated. If it is put forward as an official Western proposal . . . it will be difficult to avoid the impression that Britain and the United States have abandoned any hope that a useful treaty can be obtained.
>
> (*Daily Telegraph*, March 10, 1962.)

Thus the total international situation remains dangerous. These negative aspects of the wider international situation, and of current American policy in the sphere of armaments or in South-East Asia, need to be borne in mind when considering the parallel indications of the tentative explorations by President Kennedy and his representatives towards the possibility of some negotiated settlement over West Berlin and some of the questions of Germany and of the relations of Nato and the Warsaw Pact. These contradictions of policy are characteristic of the present international phase, when the old assumptions of the cold war programme are in reality bankrupt, but Western statesmen are still reluctant to draw the necessary conclusions.

After Fifteen Years

Fifteen years have passed since the United States under President Truman began the massive intervention in Western and Southern Europe, initially expressed through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, followed up by Nato, to disrupt, by the strength of arms and of dollars, the popular coalition communist-socialist-democratic governments which had arisen from the victory of the resistance movements over fascism, clear out the communists and establish subservient satellite governments subsidised by the United States and accepting American military occupation. Simultaneously the drive was pushed forward in Germany to repudiate Potsdam, bilk reparations, partition Germany by establishing a new West German State on the basis of the old monopolist and militarist

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

elements which had backed Hitler, and rearm this new West German State as the main American partner in Europe and centrepiece of Nato. West Berlin was tenaciously held in the American zone (although the original 'occupation rights' had only derived from the now repudiated agreements to establish a disarmed, neutral, democratic united Germany, and had thus become invalid) as an offensive advance post in the midst of socialist territory for the purposes of political, economic and military intervention and aggression. Such was the elaborate structure of the satellite cold-war anti-communist Western Europe, with American bases and military occupation, established and maintained over a decade and a half by Truman, Acheson, Eisenhower and Dulles. It is in this structure that certain cracks have now begun to appear, compelling President Kennedy to search for some new experiments in policy, some fifteen years after.

Common Market, Nato and Britain

The Common Market was initially seen by the United States as the essential coping stone of this structure, the economic-political counterpart of Nato, that is, the economic-political consolidation of a satellite cold-war Western Europe, under the domination of the trusted West German henchman, and with the aim of eradication of the dangerous obsolete illusions of national independence and sovereignty. Britain was to be thrust down from its still remaining pretensions as a world power alongside American imperialism, on the basis of the survival of the Commonwealth, imperial preference and the world rôle of sterling, to be forced to become a provincial member of the West European satellite combination, dominated by the more powerful West German partner, and cut off from the major Commonwealth countries, which could be usefully drawn into the orbit of the United States. A pretty plan, swallowed—with whatever distaste—by the subservient Macmillan in his talks with Kennedy in April of last year, and with the subsequent most laborious endeavours to ram the loathsome medicine down the throat of the reluctant Tory Party, the sceptical Labour Party and the distrustful general public. But since then all the cards have begun to shift a little out of their allotted positions, and the shape of the predestined outcome has become less certain. It is even possible that after Asia, after Africa, after Latin America, even Western Europe may begin to move.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shifting Relations—Economic

What has brought about these signs of shifts—not yet definite changes, but signs of some shifts of orientation, which may prelude further changes—in the political and diplomatic pattern of Western Europe? Many factors are involved. But two main factors can be defined: economic and strategic. In the economic sphere the completion of the period of post-war reconstruction, with its accompanying helpless subsidised dependence of the stricken West European capitalism on the bounty of the American overlords during this initial phase, has given place to the renewal in ever sharper form of all the trading, financial and colonising ('neo-colonising') rivalries of imperialism. The United States predominance in the capitalist world has become less absolute. West German imperialism, in particular, is no longer satisfied to continue its initial resurrection as the faithful henchman of the United States, but seeks to strike out on its own, with increasing activity in the sphere of colonial penetration, especially in Africa and the Middle East. France under de Gaulle repeatedly defies the wishes of the United States, with the open aim to become an independent nuclear power. Even Britain, while trying to win favour as the 'good boy' backing the United States has in fact conducted fights of some public acrimony over tariffs, shipping and trade discrimination.

Trade War

International trading competition between the capitalist powers has become intensified within the limitations of the market of the now restricted capitalist sector of the world. Frantic exhortations to cut down labour costs in order to export more have once again become the order of the day equally in the United States, in West Germany and in Britain. Under these conditions the fading patterns of the unified cold war diplomatic structure, with the accompanying embargoes on so much of trade with the socialist third of the world, begin to look less attractive. Canada and Australia have openly defied the United States by exporting wheat to China. Britain has refused the United States orders to break off trade with Cuba. West Germany has been the most insistent and censorious to condemn British participation in the Leipzig Trade Fair and demand a boycott, only to participate on a much larger scale from West German manufacturers. Similarly West Germany has been the most clamorous, in accordance with the Hallstein Doctrine, to condemn any relations with the socialist states of Eastern Europe which

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

recognise the German Democratic Republic. But in 1961 exports from West Germany to Eastern Europe totalled £250 million in contrast to £105 million from Britain (*Financial Times,* May 17, 1962). 'The economic boom is over', Herr Krupp has roundly declared in the annual report of his monster combine in April of this year. The 'economic miracles' of the subsidised utopias from the golden horn of limitless dollars are over. The realities of capitalism have returned to hit the suckers on the head.

Shifting Relations—Strategic

No less important is the shift in strategic relations. All the assumptions of the cold war strategy and Nato, of Western superiority and nuclear invincibility, have been exploded by modern development. Five years have passed since the first Sputnik demonstrated this bankruptcy to the world. General Norstad at Nato headquarters may still enjoy his imaginary golf:

> In his office he has a vast wall map covered with flags and symbols denoting the deployment of his massive forces. He is a brilliant golfer. In quiet moments he delights to take his niblick and gently flick balls off the carpet at the map. His target—Moscow. His aim is excellent.
>
> (*Daily Express,* March 9, 1962.)

But General Norstad has reached the end of his term and is about to leave. His theories are obsolete. The whole cumbrous structure of Nato has begun to come into question in the days of the intercontinental ballistic missile.

After the Wall

In Europe the decisive turning point has been the successful construction of the Berlin Wall on August 13, 1961. The gap in the socialist frontier was closed. The systematic economic sabotage, backed by the hundreds of millions of pounds of subsidy to West Berlin, in order to wreck socialist construction, was stopped. The dreams of the West German militarists of an easy blitzkrieg through the gap, in the guise of 'coming to the rescue of our brothers in the East' before the main forces on either side could be engaged, received a check, and had to be replaced by the tougher problem of contemplating the dubious hazard of an assault on the continuous armed frontier of the entire socialist system of states. West Berlin, deprived of its loot and labour from the East, has begun to wither economically and require still more gigantic subsidies to be main-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tained, at the same time as it has lost most of its significance, save for prestige purposes, for the West.

> West Berlin is a city withering on the vine. A city living on tick—facing the necessity of loans from the Federal Government in Bonn and from the Americans simply in order to keep alive.
>
> (*Daily Express*, January 19, 1962.)

After August 13 it became obvious that the artificial 'occupation status' of West Berlin could no longer be maintained indefinitely and that sooner or later the question of peace with Germany and recognition of the German Democratic Republic would have to be faced.

Warning to the West

At first a violent outcry from the West German and American militarists followed the construction of the Berlin wall. Every kind of threat was uttered. Provocative military steps were staged. Intentions were proclaimed to march in armoured columns and use nuclear weapons, if necessary, to protect the 'sacred rights' of the Western military occupation of West Berlin. When these provocations were reaching a dangerous height, the precautionary step of the Soviet nuclear tests to be prepared to meet any such threats had a remarkably sobering effect on the hotheads, since they revealed beyond dispute the vanity of any such playing with fire. From this moment a certain change in the American official attitude on the higher levels became manifest, as well as among some influential circles in West Germany, although a clamour of 'Betrayed!', 'Sold by the West!' began to sound from the Hitlerites and extreme Right in West Germany, while the Western yellow press and the Brandt-Gaitskell type of Social Democracy continued to try to stoke the fires of hatred. The antics of General Clay and Vice-President Lyndon Johnson in West Berlin were ingloriously brought to an end. As Arthur Dean, chief U.S. negotiator at the Geneva test ban talks said, in a speech in New York on January 24, 1962:

> If you examine the possibilities of world destruction with care and reason I think you will come to the conclusion that the only thing you can do is to try to work out some way of reaching agreement with the Soviet Union.

Towards a Settlement on West Berlin and Germany?

The prolonged bilateral U.S.-Soviet negotiations on West Berlin and Germany have followed. On April 24 the Soviet Foreign

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Minister Gromyko stated in the Supreme Soviet that in the talks between the U.S. Secretary of State Rusk and the Soviet Ambassador Dobrynin the United States had shown a 'realistic understanding of the problem involved'. He described as 'a step forward' the American readiness to tie in a declaration of respect for East German sovereignty with an agreement on access to West Berlin. He further said that understanding had been reached in principle on the need to conclude a non-aggression pact between Nato and the Warsaw Treaty organisation. No official report has yet appeared of the plans under discussion for a settlement. Any longer-term settlement would require a peace treaty, recognition of the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic, and replacement of the obsolete 'occupation status' of West Berlin by an alternative agreed status as a Free City. Unofficial reports have suggested that Dean Rusk has indicated that, in return for a continued right of maintenance of token Western troops in West Berlin, the United States would be prepared to consider recognition of the frontiers of the German Democratic Republic, including the Oder-Neisse line; separate political status of West Berlin from West Germany; withholding of nuclear arms from Germany (while maintaining American nuclear arms in Germany); a non-aggression treaty between Nato and the Warsaw Pact organisation; and some form of international consultative or checking committee (details still in dispute) in relation to the guaranteed rights of access to West Berlin. All such reports of course are unconfirmed; and the situation may be varied by further negotiation. But it is evident that serious U.S.-Soviet negotiations have been taking place in this sphere.

Adenauer's Anger

Chancellor Adenauer's fury in face of these U.S.-Soviet negotiations has been unconcealed. With bitter regret for a lost golden age he has referred to the vanishing of the era of Eisenhower and Dulles, when American policy was clear and satisfactory from the standpoint of Adenauer. In contrast, he stated in a message to his special envoy in Washington on April 24:

> In the present era of Kennedy there appears to be no clear aim in his German policy. America accepted as a natural thing the building of the German Wall. America appears to regard German unification as a completely theoretical question.

Any settlement, he declared repeatedly, which implied any recognition of the German Democratic Republic, was wholly 'unaccept-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able'. The U.S.-Soviet negotiations were useless, could achieve no result, and should be broken off. De Gaulle echoed the same line, reflecting as always West German wishes. Brentano was sent hot-foot to Washington to argue his case with Kennedy. In vain. The Kennedy-Macmillan talks communique on April 29 emphasised that the bilateral U.S.-Soviet negotiations would continue. According to the Washington correspondent of *The Times* (April 30, 1962):

> There appears to be no question of the Anglo-American diplomatic offensive being called off to achieve a surface unity with France and West Germany.

Snub for Macmillan

At the same meeting *The Times* correspondent further indicated that any plan for an independent visit by Macmillan to Moscow was also knocked on the head at Washington. According to this report it was agreed that a future Summit Conference would be bilateral:

> There appears to be no question of the Prime Minister going to Moscow in the near future alone, as he did in 1959. Circumstances have changed. . . . The idea of only one Western leader going to the summit apparently found favour. Such meetings are attractive to the extent that they avoid much of the paraphernalia of a larger gathering, and it was agreed that if another such meeting is held Mr. Kennedy should represent the West.

Macmillan's attempt to figure as the 'good boy' enjoying a 'special relationship' with the Big Boss ('what special relationship?', as de Gaulle later contemptuously asked, when the point was raised by a pressman) was thus unceremoniously squashed. In different forms Macmillan, Adenauer and de Gaulle all received their rebuffs.

Adenauer-de Gaulle Axis

From the side of Adenauer and de Gaulle the counter-offensive was launched to develop their Little Europe ('Common Market'), not only into a fixed cold war association, as the United States had intended, but, closer to the original Hitlerite pattern and inspiration of the 'New Order in Europe', with an edge turned against the United States and Britain, as well as against the Soviet Union.

> American correspondents in Germany report that Dr. Adenauer is considering a major change in policy that will bring West Germany into closer association with France and may ultimately have the effect of denying full membership of the European Common Market to Britain.

'Fralit' became the new watchword, expressing the Axis unification, as under Hitler, Mussolini and Petain, of France, Germany and Italy (France, Allemagne, Italie), with a disdainful attitude to Benelux

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which had tended to side with Britain in the negotiations of the Six. The new campaign was launched by de Gaulle's portentous and oracular press conference of May 16. Criticising the U.S.-Soviet negotiations, he said:

> The risk of any negotiation was that it might lead to a western retreat and weaken Franco-German solidarity, on which rested all hopes of unifying Europe whose destiny was at stake from the Atlantic to the Urals.

Hitlerite echoes indeed. De Gaulle poured scorn on the conception of a non-European 'federator' (*i.e.*, the United States) endeavouring to impose a supra-national union on the living 'Franco-German solidarity' which would eventually 'unify' Europe 'from the Atlantic to the Urals'.

Britain Gets All the Kicks

Thus with this new turn of the wheel Britain, under the supine and bankrupt leadership of Macmillan and Toryism (aided by Gaitskell and Brown), gets all the kicks. The United States, West Germany and France all in turn deliver snubs and rebuffs to Britain, confident that Macmillan will never have the hardihood to adopt the obvious alternative and enter into closer relations with the new rising world. Indeed, there are more indications that West Germany to judge from the expression of increasingly influential alternative forces there (Dehler, Mende and the Free Democrats, as well as some in Adenauer's party) might perform the classic operation, and after insisting on the harshest letter of the law of the cold war to foil Britain and the United States, steal a march to try the switch first.

Cross-Currents in West Germany

Already the battle of rival foreign policies has become intense in West Germany. The pro-Adenauer journal *Die Zeit* of Hamburg on May 4 warned against the growing influence of those who

> dream seductive, however dangerous, dreams of a unified but neutral Germany which plays the rôle of an 'arbitrator' between Europe and Russia. . . . Dr. Adenauer is old, and many are the people who ask the question whether Dr. Adenauer's successors will be as successful as he in resisting or preventing these false political dreams.

In the recently published book *The New Germany and the Old Nazis* the author, T. H. Tetens, recalls:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> When in 1949 the foreign press revealed that a group of ultra-conservative business men (among them banker Hermann Abs, Professor Ludwig Ehrhardt . . .) has discussed the possibilities of Russo-German collaboration, Dr. Adenauer admonished his party friends to be extremely careful: 'We must move very cautiously. We ought not to give the impression either in Germany or in the United States that we shall collaborate in any way with the Russians.'

Shades of Stresemann. The author concluded:

> The popular view of the Bonn Republic as a bulwark against Communism is a dangerous illusion nourished by German propaganda. No German statesman or government would hesitate for a moment to strike a bargain with Moscow if the Kremlin were willing to make an attractive offer.

Ambassador Kroll has been sent back by Adenauer to Moscow, despite the outcry by pro-American partisans against his conversations. The hard-bitten West German imperialists have always made a speciality of playing both ends against the middle and keeping a variety of irons in the fire.

From Neville Chamberlain to Macmillan

In this jungle the once super-crafty British imperialists, represented today by Macmillan and Home, with Gaitskell and Brown as their lieutenants, are proving as unsuccessful and lost as Neville Chamberlain and Baldwin in the days of Munich. And for the same basic reason, because they are too ready to swallow any bait, provided the hook is labelled 'anti-communism'. Today, with weakened resources, they have become everybody's butt. From one side, the United States kicks Britain to enter the Common Market and be cut off from the Commonwealth. Painfully the obedient process of indoctrination has been going on in the Tory Party, in the trade unions and the Labour Party, and in the press, to accustom the long-suffering British public to the idea of surrendering national independence. And now, when the bamboozling process is nearly complete, from the other side Adenauer and de Gaulle deliver their kick and indicate that they may not want Britain anyway. Adenauer suggests that Britain can hardly become a 'full member', perhaps an 'associate' (like Senegal). Of course the Commonwealth must go; Little Europe 'must not become too big', muses Adenauer, 'otherwise it would burst'. Spaak suggests that to ensure full political unity 'Britain will have to be sacrificed'. 'I prefer a politically

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

integrated Europe of the Six to a commercial magma of seven, eight, or nine.' And so on ad nauseam.

Time for an Independent Foreign Policy

Is it not time for a change of course? 'Agonising Decision', writes Walter Lippmann:

> The grand project is caught up in a crisis of power and leadership within the Western Alliance. . . . For the British the terms of admission present a truly agonising decision. . . . The old political and human allegiance of the Empire and the Commonwealth will suffer a rude and painful, if not a fatal shock. . . . For the short run the prospect is gloomy if we expect a full solution. . . . We may count ourselves fortunate if the negotiations are not broken off and if a way is found to continue them, perhaps for some years.
>
> (*New York Herald Tribune*, May 19, 1962.)

Thus the voice of American political wisdom. Their 'gloomy prospect' can encourage all who are fighting for the independence of Britain. Is it not time to break free from the trap? Is it not time to advance to an independent foreign policy, and to answer the American, West German or Gaullist blackmail by playing the trump cards which are open to an independent Britain to play—that is, to take the initiative in opening new approaches for diplomatic and practical co-operation with the Soviet Union, China, India, with the whole rising world of socialism and national liberation, that is, with the majority of the peoples of the world alongside the peoples of the Commonwealth for the ending of the cold war, for peaceful co-existence, for general and complete disarmament? Such an advance would require a change in the political leadership of Britain. It would require a change in the present policies of the Labour Party. Popular opinion is already groping for an alternative policy. The present speed of events in Europe and the world, which may bring many further turns and changes in political orientation, make it all the more urgent to achieve this advance in Britain.

May 21, 1962. R.P.D.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONALISATION BETRAYED?

W. Paynter

Secretary of the National Union of Mineworkers

IS there a basic change in policy operated against the nationalised industries and their position in Britain's economy? What is being done to the main nationalised industries—the mines and the railways? What is the significance of closures and contraction, whilst the public pay more?

In essence the policy being operated on British Railways is the same as that for British mining; in both cases it is the antithesis of economic planning. It is 'pay your way or else' and 'survive by your ability to compete'. These are the new harsh economic doctrines for nationalised mines and railways. Yet the railways are an essential public service and the coal mines exploit the only national energy resource this country possesses.

My union regards the Tory Government as responsible for changing the policy within the mining industry and for the new harsh measures. It amounts to treachery towards the industries and communities which depend upon them.

The special measures which are to be operated in the coal mining areas described as the heavily losing areas, such as Scotland, South Wales and Lancashire, include big increases in industrial and domestic coal prices, which must accelerate the fall in demand and necessitate further cut-back in production; and the closing of pits, including mines in Scotland that have been put down since nationalisation, involving unemployment amongst the miners. On British Railways the same policy with the same results: increased fares and freight rates, which must cut back traffic further; the amputation of uneconomic services, the massive closing of lines and rail shops involving unemployment amongst the railwaymen. This is to be the magic economic remedy.

What is the record with regard to nationalisation in mining? From vesting date to 1956, in a period of growing demand, the industry was treated as a public service. Coal prices were government-controlled below market level, at £1 to £2 under West European prices and well under delivered American coal prices. The industry was forced to meet a loss of over £70 million on imported coal. Had the industry been allowed then to operate as a commercial undertaking, as directed now, hundreds of millions of pounds of reserves could have been accumulated. Since 1957 we have faced a period

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of falling demand and a deliberate cut back of production. The National Coal Board's financial deficit then was due to having to carry the cost of ameliorating social hardship caused by closing pits and stocking coal. Under government direction, capital investment was geared to a target of 240 million tons coal output by 1965. It is now set for 200 million tons, but the capital liabilities and interest charges have to be set against the smaller target. Increased coal prices and the accumulated deficit of £90 million is directly due to this history of government policy.

The financial consequences of the past non-commercial operations of the National Coal Board should be taken over by the government before another pit is closed or another penny is added to the price of coal.

When Sir James Bowman, previous Chairman of the National Coal Board, gave evidence before the Select Committee on Nationalised Industries in July, 1957, he pointed out that the British industry had been subsidised by artificially low coal prices because the Government considered it necessary as a means of maintaining full employment, and added:

> However, if we are to act as a public service, let it be quite clear that we are such: and that we are not going from time to time, to be tripped up, as attempts are being made to trip us up, in relation to our balance sheet.

On transport, the Select Committee supported the same contention:

> Your Committee wish to recommend the principle that where Government action causes a nationalised industry to incur a specific loss or specific expenditure, which it would not otherwise incur, the Government should take steps to compensate the industry.

This point of view was also endorsed by the Federation of British Industries and the British Iron and Steel Federation.

What of regional coal price increases? In its report issued in April, 1958, the Select Committee on Nationalised Industries stated:

> The price of coal is fixed so that, broadly, the industry should make neither a substantial profit nor a substantial loss; average prices are designed to cover average costs. On this basis, rather more than half of the coal produced will be sold at a profit, while a substantial part of the other half of the coal produced will be sold at a loss; and accordingly it would be wrong to call all pits producing coal at a loss uneconomic. The Board's undertakings must be viewed as a whole.

If the Board's undertakings must be viewed as a whole, it seems clear that the policy of regional price increases and the new financial approach where each Division has to take measures to pay its way, at least on an operational basis, is a fundamental departure from this traditional policy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What is the reason for this? What significance must we attach to the change? I can only express a personal viewpoint: the reason for this change is again a direct result of government economic and financial policy. They say that the coalmining industry must now operate on a strictly commercial basis. The accumulated burdens remain of fifteen years' operations, largely as a public service; but the industry's rôle in the national economy is to change. Nationalisation of the power industries was intended to facilitate a fuel policy and economic planning. The only fuel policy this country has had since the war was one that was financed by the coalmining industry. Now it is to be a free-for-all. The dictum of the Ministry is that the size of the coal industry must be determined by its ability to compete. Harsh measures, they say, must be taken—regional price increases and pit closures. They are callously indifferent to the industrial and social consequences of their policy.

In *Labour Monthly* two years ago* I stated that there was 'a crisis in the coal industry brought about by the policy of the Government'. I stated that the government were projecting new policies for nationalised industries which involved decentralisation of accounting and trading as well as more stringent financial controls. The instrument to effect these changes, although the original intentions have been modified, is the government's White Paper on the *Financial and Economic Obligations of Nationalised Industries,* published in April, 1961. Financial targets, broken down and applied to each region, have now been fixed for the nationalised electricity and gas industries. Discussions are now proceeding between the National Coal Board and the government to fix the financial target for the coal industry. The policy of accounting profit and loss as a divisional responsibility and determining coal prices by divisional results appears to be the forerunner of the current financial approach.

The important development is that the Board's undertakings are *not* now being viewed as a whole.

Under the 1947 Nationalisation Act, it was established as a corporate body, a single entity, responsible to the Minister for discharging the duties and obligations vested in it. The Divisional Boards, unlike the Regional Boards in gas and electricity, have no statutory authority, not being mentioned in the Act but created by

Crisis in Coal, by W. Paynter August, 1960

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the National Coal Board as subordinate administrative bodies. The policy was to be directed to securing:

> That the revenues of the Board shall not be less than sufficient for meeting all their outgoings properly chargeable to revenue account . . . on an average of good and bad years.

It appears that the statutory obligation placed upon the National Coal Board is by administrative interpretation now to become the obligation of each Divisional Board.

I regard this as directly contrary to the fundamental principle upon which nationalisation of the mines was based; it is a betrayal of the repeated pledges given to the miners, that the British coalfields would be treated as a corporate body, a national unit; that the strong would help to carry the weak in good times and in bad times.

The deficit coalfields are not such by choice. The accident of age and geology are not man-made deficiencies. The mining of coal is not an undertaking to be started or stopped on the narrow considerations of profit or loss, or by the dictates of economic expediency. Vast amounts of social capital are laid down to get at coal seams in the depths of the earth's crust. It is a once-and-for-all bounty of heat and energy in abundance in our own country, and it is criminal wantonly to sterilize seams of workable coal.

The effects of the new approach to Divisional obligations ought, I believe, to be judged against the Government's policy of free-for-all competition, their refusal to introduce a national fuel policy, and the pressures building up to import cheaper American coal. If Divisional results are to determine coal prices, does it mean that eventually coal prices will be reduced in the low-cost Divisions? Does it mean that eventually low-cost coalfields will compete in the high-cost Divisions for the diminishing markets? Is it now possible that 'freedom of choice for the consumer' can be extended from a choice, as between fuel oil and coal, to the consumer's choice of importing low-cost British coal into higher cost Divisions? Are we witnessing, by the backdoor method of administrative action, the implementation of the Government's original aims of decentralisation in accounting and trading? If the national character of the mining industry is broken down, will there arise new pulls and stresses within the National Union of Mineworkers which will affect the national character of agreements? No one wants to return to District agreements; the best way to avoid that is to preserve the national character of the industry in all ways.

The problem is not only one for Scotland and the older coalfields.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not only a problem for mining and other nationalised industries. It is a problem for the whole labour and trade union movement.

As far as mining is concerned, a Special Conference in November, 1959, laid down the demands* of the National Union of Mineworkers, which place a clear obligation upon the union at all levels to assist areas facing the economic and social consequences of pit closures. Work in other coalfields is not a satisfactory alternative employment. If men wish voluntarily to transfer to other coalfields, of course they should receive every material assistance; but we have never been in favour of conscription of labour by the fear of unemployment and economic coercion.

Our policy is supported by the Trades Union Congress and the Parliamentary Labour Party. Together, we are stronger than any government. In action together, we can avoid the threatening economic and social disaster.

**A policy of economic expansion* and full employment the responsibility for which rests upon the Government. Such a policy is necessary to accommodate the great technological changes taking place, to stimulate production in basic industries and to maintain full employment. Within such a policy there must be provision to increase demand for the products of expanding industry by increasing wages and salaries, reducing working hours and increasing leisure time.

A National Fuel Policy to replace the present 'free-for-all' to be based upon Government assessment of annual fuel requirements of the nation, and providing for the coal industry the share of national requirements commensurate with its position as a valuable national asset, such share to be under-written or guaranteed by the Government. Given a policy of economic expansion, the coal industry's required output should certainly be considerably higher than it is at present. Within such a national policy the share of other national fuel industries would also be determined, and co-ordination and consultation established between the national fuel industries.

Distribution of industries by Government inducements and controls to mitigate the effects of any industrial contraction and restriction of recruitment to provide employment opportunity within mining communities.

Pit Closures. The union will insist that no pit closures (to cut back production) should take place until, or unless, alternative employment, either within the industry or in another industry, is available to fully accommodate the displaced men.

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION

An American correspondent writes: 'On page 56 of the February issue, you state that the U.S. constitution does not provide for removal of a U.S. president. This is not correct. If you remember, President Andrew Johnson was impeached under Article 1, Section 3, para. 6 of the U.S. constitution, which provides for the removal of the President by a two thirds vote of the Senate. This occurred in 1867 ind Johnson was acquitted'.

[We are most indebted to our correspondent for this correction on the constitutional position in the United States. It may be noted that despite this formal constitutional possibility no President has yet been removed by constitutional means in the United States, though a number have been removed by violence or otherwise died during office.—Ed., *L.M.*]

The treatment accorded to Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their goodwill. . . .

Extract from No. 6 of President Wilson's *Fourteen Points*, 1918.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HALT THE ARMS RACE

E. H. S. Burhop

THE radioactive clouds are forming again over the coral atolls of the South Pacific, over British islands lent for this purpose to the United States Government by Mr. Macmillan. Mr. Khrushchov says that following the resumed American tests his own country will resume testing. And so the arms race continues to new heights of activity. Recent estimates have suggested that already the United States possesses sufficient nuclear weapons to destroy all major Soviet bases and cities many times over. The U.S.S.R. on its side, according to Marshal Malinovsky, has sufficient weapons to destroy every Western base.

Our political leaders see no end to the cold war. President Kennedy, Mr. Macmillan, Lord Home—all have developed the theme that for generations, as long ahead as can be foreseen, we must regard the cold war as a fact of life. We have to live, armed to the teeth with nuclear weapons, with rockets on their launching pads, aimed at every great city in the world, waiting to be set off on their fateful journey. Granted that no responsible leader in any of the great nations today is so crazy as to wish to solve differences by nuclear war, nevertheless, the risk of war coming anyway is frighteningly great. A mistaken signal, an erroneous interpretation of traces on a radar screen, and some trigger-happy commander of a Polaris submarine or a captain of an airborne rocket launching plane, may give the fateful order that will set a nuclear weapon off on its irrevocable way. Never have the High Commands of the great armies of the world had under their control such a devastating array of power. So far the civil power has remained supreme, but how can it be expected that this will persist indefinitely. Revolts by the army have been a feature of the post-war scene in many of the smaller countries. If certain sections of the U.S. army were in political control, what chance would remain of avoiding war? 'If it were not for the politicians I would settle the war in one afternoon by bombing Soviet Russia', said General Twining, one-time American Supreme Commander. 'Complete eradication of the Soviet system must be our national goal', said the powerful American Air Force Association recently. The risk of war coming as a result of an army coup or, indeed, of the election of an American President from the right-wing lunatic fringe, is a factor to be reckoned with.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The new series of nuclear tests may enable the perfection of yet another terrible hazard—the nuclear armed satellite. If the cold war persists, the skies are likely to become alive with satellites, armed with nuclear weapons, ready to be brought down on our cities at the command of a remote radio signal. How can any sane person believe that mankind can survive generation after generation facing such hazards? There is no future for mankind save through disarmament, prompt, general and complete.

The burning question that faces us, however, concerns the way disarmament can be achieved. Ever since the end of the war, negotiations have been continuing in various committees and sub-committees, both inside and outside the United Nations Organisation, on the question of disarmament, the abolition of nuclear weapons and the cessation of nuclear tests. No agreement has been reached. The negotiators were clearly insufficiently seized with the urgency of the situation. They could not rise above the limitations imposed by cold war prejudices and misunderstandings. Recent experiences of negotiations in this field have shown that even today, in spite of the urgency of the threat posed to the whole of humanity, new negotiations will not succeed unless the ordinary people make it clear that they are not prepared to allow discussions to go on interminably while mankind edges ever closer toward the brink. This is where the World Conference on Disarmament, to be held in Moscow this coming July, takes on a special significance. From all countries the ordinary people will get together to see whether they can succeed in pointing the way where the politicians have failed.

Basically, the main factors standing in the way of agreement on disarmament are the suspicions and misconceptions engendered by the cold war. Meetings of sincere people, alive to the great issues at stake, can sweep away the fog of misunderstanding and can generate the warmth that will melt the ice of the cold war. When they return to their own countries they can help to catalyse that great upsurge of public opinion which alone can force a change of attitude at government level, can show an alternative policy to the sterile course of interminable cold war and save humanity from the fate that at present appears to be bearing down inexorably upon it.

We believe that the only security against the corruption of the few and the degradation of the many is to give to the great body of the people their political and social rights.

Henry Vincent, speaking to the Working Men's Association, February 28, 1837.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CHINESE PEOPLE'S CONGRESS

[We print below the Resolution passed on April 10, 1962, at the Third Session of the Second National People's Congress in Peking. The Congress lasted from March 27 to April 16. Premier Chou En-lai gave the main report on behalf of the government. Before it was endorsed, the deputies discussed it in separate groups for twelve days, and then resumed in plenary session for a further week, during which 164 deputies took the floor. Chu Teh, Chairman of the Standing Committee, made the closing speech at the last plenary session, which was also attended by Mao Tse-tung, Liu Shao-chi, Soong Ching Ling, Tung Pi-wu and other leaders.—Ed., L.M.]

THE Third session of the Second National People's Congress heard and discussed fully the report on government work made by Premier Chou En-lai on behalf of the State Council.

Since 1958, under the wise leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and Chairman Mao Tse-tung and holding aloft the glorious banners of the general line for building socialism, the big leap forward and the People's Communes, the people of all nationalities of our country have displayed great initiative and creativeness and made a series of great achievements on all fronts of socialist construction, laying the preliminary foundation for the building of a system of independent, complete and modern national economy in China. In this period, our country suffered from serious natural calamities for three consecutive years and our national economy has been confronted with great difficulties. The government has done much work and achieved outstanding results in uniting the people of various nationalities throughout the country to overcome the natural calamities, in improving the functioning of rural people's communes and restoring and expanding agricultural production, in adjusting the rate of growth of the national economy and the relative proportions of its component parts, and in summing up experience and overcoming shortcomings and mistakes in work. At present, the economic situation of our country has begun to take a turn for the better. The session fully agrees to the principle and the tasks of making further adjustments in the national economy put forward in the report on government work; it considers that the thorough implementation of the principle and tasks will definitely overcome every difficulty in the road of our advance and provide even more favourable conditions for the new advance of our national economy in the future.

The session considers that the further development of democracy in the political life of the country, the strengthening of democratic centralism, the consolidation of the people's democratic dictatorship and the development of the people's democratic united front, as embodied in the report on government work, are of vital importance for strengthening the great unity of the people of all nationalities of the country and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for developing and safeguarding our socialist cause. This must be carried out thoroughly and conscientiously in all spheres of work in the future.

The present international situation is very favourable for the struggle of the people of the world for peace, national liberation, democracy and socialism. The development of the international struggle is complicated; it has twists and turns. But the main trend in the international situation continues to be 'the east wind prevailing over the west wind'. The session fully agrees with the general line and the specific policies governing our foreign relations put forward in the report on government work, to which our country has consistently adhered. In the future, our country will continue to strengthen its unity with the socialist countries, continue to strengthen its unity with all peace-loving peoples and countries of the world, strive for peaceful co-existence with countries having different social systems, support the revolutionary struggles of the oppressed nations and the oppressed peoples of various countries, oppose the policy of agression and the policy of war of the imperialist bloc headed by the United States, and defend world peace.

The Farmworker improves pig production;
The Intellectual helps the Farmworker.

The session resolved to endorse the report on government work made by Premier Chou En-lai.

The session agrees to the proposal of the State Council that the stand-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing committee of the National People's Congress be authorised to examine and ratify the plan for the adjustment of the national economy in the last two years of the second five-year plan and the corresponding state budget.

The session calls on the workers, peasants, intellectuals and other working people of all nationalities throughout the country, the democratic parties and non-party democrats, patriotic elements of the national bourgeoisie, patriotic overseas Chinese and all other patriots to unite even more closely and, under the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party and Chairman Mao Tse-tung, hold still higher the three red banners of the general line, the big leap forward and the People's Communes, be diligent and economical, work wholeheartedly for the prosperity of the country and strive for new victories in building socialism.

LABOUR MONTHLY FORTY YEARS AGO

LANSBURY ON POPLARISM

Sooner or later the Labour Party must face all the implications of administrative responsibility. The workers must be given tangible proof that Labour administration means something different from Capitalist administration, and in a nutshell this means diverting wealth from wealthy ratepayers to the poor. Those who pretend that a sound Labour policy can be pursued either nationally or locally without making the rich poorer should find another party. The Poplar Labour Party has held all through that its policy on the borough council and the board of guardians is the sound Labour policy. It claims that its policy (so often 'exposed' in the Press) is only that which has been laid down on many occasions by the national Labour Party and by other Labour organisations. And lastly, it claims that its policy has been proved to be right by its results. The workers of Poplar, realising the value of deeds as against words, have rallied to the support of the local Labour Parties in a manner which astonishes those who only propagate by words. What our friends Thomas and others have to realise is that they themselves are still only in the stage of talking about Labour Party policy. It is easy to say 'Work or maintenance for the unemployed'. The attack upon Poplar, which, by their speeches they apparently endorse, is the direct result of Poplar's endeavour to do the things which others only talk about. . . . The issue that is raised by Poplar is larger than an issue of local government. It is the whole question whether the Labour Movement means business. Are we going to attempt to carry out what we say on the platform, or are we to be misled and side-tracked by considerations of 'statesmanship'. I have no doubt of the answer of the rank and file members of the Labour Movement. We all need to stand together, and not to waste time belittling and decrying one another's work. That is why I deplore the attacks which have been made against our work by some friends in high places in the movement, and which have compelled me to write this article.

(From 'Poplar and the Labour Party' by George Lansbury, *Labour Monthly*, June, 1922.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties

MOTOR WORKERS AND THE COMMON MARKET

Peter Nicholas

WHAT are the prospects for the British motor worker if Britain joins the European Common Market? Will participation mean greater security, a departure from the seasonal character of the industry, and better wages and working conditions in the industry? Will the workers be able to hold the position they have won up to now, as a consequence of their militant struggles? Will this mean, as Mr. Macmillan forecast at Stockton at the beginning of April, 'going into the Six would bring peace and security, rising prosperity and happiness for the British people'? Or is this just another empty election promise like 'doubling our standard of living in the next 25 years'?

These are the questions that many trade unionists in the industry must be asking themselves, as the Tory Government with right-wing support, manoeuvres to join the Common Market.

The Tory Government and the employers admit that competition will be fierce, but their spokesmen bravely speak of their ability to overcome the obstacles, failing of course to say at whose expense this will be. The government and the employers have recognised that to regain the lost export markets in North America is but a pipe dream. Sales in America will be very much restricted as a result of the manufacture by the United States motor employers of the 'compact car' and also the share of imports from Western Germany, France and Italy that have been lost by Great Britain. Any hope of exporting to North America on the scale achieved in the 1950's is forever ended.

So they now turn their attention to the European market, as a means of selling their surplus production. In Western Germany, France and Italy they face formidable opposition from the motor industry built up since the end of the war, and the lessons of the American export drive and its precarious basis have apparently not been learned. Having lost in the battle against American monopolies they now prepare to take on the European monopolies. They hope to win this battle despite the fact that like Britain, all the Common Market countries are following a financial policy of restricting home consumption and imports, and endeavouring to expand greatly their

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exports. In addition wages generally of the West European car workers are less than those of the British motor workers, which means that labour costs and purchasing power are less.

But even assuming that these obstacles can be overcome, and this is very doubtful, is there a potential market for the tremendous output capacity of Europe's car industry, which is even now being expanded both in Great Britain and on the continent?

The purpose of entry into the Common Market becomes more obvious every day as British car firms export their capital to Europe. British Motor Corporation are producing Austin models in Italy as a result of links with Innocenti; Lucas have recently acquired an interest in French industry; Standards have several assembly plants in Europe; Rovers are in Spain and have a tie-up in Western Germany recently concluded. True, at present these plants are only for assembly, but they could eventually be producing complete vehicles. In this setting the trend to monopoly will increase. More and more of the small firms will disappear. In the recent period Standards have been absorbed by Leyland; rumours have been rife of a Rover-Standard, Rover-Rolls Royce, Rover-Alvis merger and although nothing has yet materialised, the writing is on the wall. Big firms like British Motor Corporation see this as an opportunity to swallow the minnows. Everything points to only two or three big monopolies remaining in Britain: British Motor Corporation, Ford, General Motors (Vauxhall). On the continent a bitter struggle is in progress between the giants of Ford, British Motor Corporation, Volkswagen, Fiat and Renault. Agreements could be concluded by the monopolies to carve up markets in Europe, each concentrating on production of a particular model, the overall plan being to make even greater profits with an even smaller labour force.

In this situation what will be the fate of the motor workers in Britain? What of the Coventry car workers, many in Birmingham and those in the new expansion areas of Scotland and Merseyside? This is the prospect of the European Common Market—much more like a European common monopoly. The effects of the Common Market on trade with the Commonwealth cannot be underestimated and with food and dairy supplies coming from Denmark, France and Belgium the question arises as to whether countries like Australia and New Zealand will continue to buy vehicles from Britain if we buy our food in Europe.

These are the economic implications of the European Common Market, but what of the political implications? Entry into the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Common Market of course has its contradictions amongst the ruling class, and not only is the labour movement opposing entry, but many Tories including M.P.s and industrialists who have a finger in the Empire pie. But Britain's surge towards the Common Market is capitulation to American finance capital and British industry is to be sacrificed to strengthen the political aim of the Common Market —to roll back communism. It is their old dream of a United States of Europe cutting the capitalist world into areas of exploitation.

Many progressive trade unionists and some of the national trade unions themselves, have seen as the only answer to the uncertainties of the motor industry, with its booms and slumps, its seasonal character and lack of planning, the nationalisation of the industry with planned production and markets. The political tie-up of the Common Market could seriously impede a future socialist government in Britain; it could impede nationalising the industry and using it for the benefit of the people and not for the benefit of shareholders.

To oppose Britain's entry into the Common Market is not to say that there is no avenue for Britain's car production, and that therefore we should contract the industry. With the demand for improved living standards of the scientific age, both at home and abroad, the industry has far from reached saturation point. At home, given increased purchasing power and more leisure time the motor car will still be very much in demand. Improved road communications, town planning and development, the building of many more houses, schools, hospitals and universities would bring a corresponding demand for the commercial vehicles and equipment the motor industry can so well provide. Overseas in the less developed countries of Asia and Africa where feudal means of agriculture and housing prevail, there is a vast untapped market for industrial progress in which special-purpose vehicles can play their part. These countries must be given financial aid and long-term loans to carry out these projects to industrialise their countries. They must be given every encouragement and help to improve their way of life. It will have a two-fold effect: of providing British workers with jobs and of raising the standards of millions who live in poverty. Far more must be done to develop trade with the socialist countries. A few hundred cars sold to Poland by Standards and the few Land Rovers to China are the trickle which could be turned into a flood of orders.

This alternative to the Common Market has, however, one im-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

portant pre-requisite. To build the roads at home, the houses, schools and hospitals, there will have to be the diversion of money to these projects, from the money being spent on armaments. Money cannot be found to improve the standard of living and the social services, to help the less developed countries, and to spend money on building up armaments. For the motor workers, as for every worker, there is no alternative. Each has a stake in the success of disarmament talks and peaceful co-existence.

There is a burning need to strengthen the international trade union movement, particularly in the motor industry, as the plans for the Common Market are put into effect. The criminal folly of the right-wing policy of breaking up the World Federation of Trade Unions with its single international front can be seen now and if ever there was a question that needed the attention of a united international trade union movement, then it is this question of the Common Market and its potential menace. There needs to be an immediate meeting of the trade unionists of Britain, Western Germany, France and Italy, irrespective of the national centre affiliations, to examine the problems of the immediate future, and to make plans and preparations to prevent the monopolies putting into effect policies which can have disastrous effects for British motor workers. The labour movement must be roused to the dangers of the European Common Market, and this campaign must be speeded up in every trade union branch, shop stewards' committee, trades council and national trade union conference, to bring home the dangers that exist and the alternatives that can be offered.

AFTER THE BALLOT

Dick Etheridge*

THE results of the engineers ballot for strike action has been declared—and it is an anti-climax to the very successful token strikes of February and March 5. Many active workers who never realised the implications of what was really happening behind the arrangements for the ballot are busy discussing it and asking 'Why, if the leadership knew this was going to happen, did they agree to a ballot in the first place?' The result of the ballot may reflect many things, but one thing is certain, it does not reflect the true attitude of the engineers to wages. The whole country is faced with activity of one kind or another for wage increases, and acts of solidarity like

*Mr. Etheridge, as many of our readers will know, is Convenor at British Motor Corporation.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those for the nurses, are a feature of the activity. Wage rates for piece workers are at a higher level as a consequence of hard bargaining or militant action and workers are prepared to fight on many fronts to defend their immediate interests.

The recent dayworkers strike at the Austin works was an example of this. Here was a group of workers of the most diverse interests from labourers to the most skilled—who do not normally act together and who could be expected under most circumstances to act separately to defend the interests of each separate grouping; but after eighteen months of protracted negotiations and without a call from national officials, they stood together in a strike in a way not before experienced. Then added to this was the supporting action of the pieceworkers who, accepting the justice of the dayworkers claim, supported them practically to a man.

The machining sections carried out their normal functions at the start of the Monday shift. They did one component and took it to the inspector to be viewed; he refused, being on strike; the machine operators then refused to carry on because no inspection was being done. In the toolroom they decided not to use the floor-operated electric cranes for the duration of the dispute. Many more examples of this splendid solidarity could be quoted, and it is symptomatic of so many other disputes today. Why then was the result of the National Ballot a vote against strike action? It cannot be because workers are not willing to fight in order to establish higher wages.

The basic reason lies with the attitude of the leadership after the decision to have a ballot. There is an old saying 'If you are not for us, you are against us', and the decision not to give a lead in support of strike action would be taken by many to mean that there was opposition to strike action from the leadership. Many would be influenced to think that the lack of unity would mean that it would not be successful and therefore they would not pay the attention to getting votes in the same way as if there had been a united call for a vote for strike action. For instance there was a great disparity between unions in sending out ballot papers. In some branches they did not get them until two weeks before the ballot closed. Then there was the difference between the unions in voting procedure. Some voted in the factory, some in the branches, others through the post. If there had to be a ballot (and this is debatable) there should have been co-ordination and agreement on a single voting procedure, and a single recommendation to vote for strike action followed by a campaign to realise this aim. Some are of the opinion that the vote

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was lost because much of the leadership (while expressing the opinion of neutrality) were actually campaigning against a victory for strike action. Members are looking at the results of the unions which did give a lead for strike action, particularly the Transport and General Workers Union. Where a lead was given for strike action and measures taken to support it, the result was in favour of strike action. In the Austin case the Workers Committee gave a call to vote for strike action. It issued a leaflet explaining the purpose of the wage pause and the T. & G.W.U. shop stewards campaigned in the factory on the basis of its national statement in favour of a strike. The result of the Austin ballot was a vote of two to one in favour of strike action. Wherever there was campaigning the results were overwhelmingly in favour of strike action.

The national result may give the employers some consolation and they may draw some very wrong conclusions from it, but many of the workers are drawing the conclusion that there is a need to support militants for leadership. Despite the result there is no need for pessimism. There is bound to be a reaction to it and we should do all we can to encourage members to discuss the implications of the ballot to ensure that weakness shown from top to bottom is eliminated in the future. Trade unionists should get resolutions to the executive committees of their unions insisting that the confederation press the wages claim. The strike decisions of the dockers gave food for thought; engineers have as militant a tradition.

DELEGATES AT CONFERENCES:

1. THE FARMWORKERS

Joan Maynard, J.P.*

MANY important matters were discussed by my fellow delegates at the Biennial Conference at Bournemouth, of the National Union of Agricultural Workers, held last month.

One which affects all workers in Britain, and farmworkers in particular is the common market. A resolution which opposed Britain's entry unless certain safeguards were assured for British agriculture and the commonwealth was carried by 19 votes. In moving a resolution of outright opposition to going in, I stressed the political implications which in general have been kept from the British people, whatever safeguard we may get on the economic

*As many of our readers will know, Miss Maynard is County Secretary for Yorkshire for the National Union of Agricultural Workers and was a delegate to this Conference.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

side—and in the long run it is doubtful if we will get any that are worthwhile—they will not alter the political implications of going in. The British people could no longer control their own destiny because the Common Market Council can override decisions of national governments. We should come under the domination of Western Germany, whose government contains many ex-nazis, and which is the most powerful reactionary government in Western Europe. Britain is trying to negotiate on entry when she is in a weak position economically; she is in no position to dictate terms. Only three speakers from the floor spoke in favour of going in if the right conditions could be got; one was a forestry worker, although forestry workers are amongst those hit by the pay pause, which is one of the preliminaries for going in. In view of the fact that most delegates were hearing about the political implications for the first time, the vote was close; it would have been closer if all delegates had voted according to their mandate.

On wages, hours and holidays, farmworkers asked for £10 for a 40-hour week and 3 weeks paid holiday, as did forestry workers. I was delighted that at last farmworkers have got round to asking for wages and conditions on par with forestry workers who have always had a lead, for they were saying in effect we are as important as forestry workers, and are no longer willing to take second best. The agricultural industry could afford to pay this and give those conditions. Increased mechanisation and low wages have reduced the labour force considerably; last year the farmers paid out a million pounds less than the £13,500,000 expected according to the year's Price Review. Besides, when land is up for sale, the big farmers find no difficulty in paying large prices for it; fertiliser firms, machinery firms, feeding stuffs firms are all making large profits out of the industry. It is more than time that farmworkers had much larger wages.

On the tied cottage, as burning an issue as ever, we resolved to continue by all practicable means to obtain security of tenure for farm workers, towards that end, in all instances of eviction of members, maximum publicity at local and national levels should be sought and large demonstrations organised; local authorities to be pressed vigorously to play a more positive and humane part, and our Executive Committee were instructed to press for local authorities to be granted powers of requisitioning over all dwellings that are empty for three months or more. This latter proposal sprang from my area where the union organiser carried out a survey in just

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over twenty parishes to find out how many dwellings were empty and the survey revealed more than seventy. This with the present acute shortage of houses to rent, even in the countryside, and at a time when farmers are still taking our members to the courts for possession of a tied cottage because they say they need it for another worker, even though they already have two or three standing empty. Clearly the real reason why the farmers and their Tory Government want to retain the tied cottage system is because of the economic power it gives them over the worker.

Next, on housing and council building. We asked for interest rates to be lowered to 2 per cent, so that houses to rent can be provided at a reasonable figure, and bungalows at a rent our old people can afford which on the present miserable pension would need to be very low indeed. We called for adequate water supplies and sewerage schemes, and where these exist landlords should be required to instal modern washing and lavatory facilities.

Clearly these things also need a workers' government, for very strong pressure indeed would have to be applied to force these basic needs out of the present government.

May Day came along during our conference and we sent fraternal greetings to land workers in all countries, and pledged the support of our union in the efforts now being made to raise living standards of primary producers everywhere. We also added our voices to those in all lands who call for statesmen to work unceasingly for peace and the abolition of want the world over. It is easier to pass this kind of resolution than to bring it about; but these things can and will be won, when workers understand better what the problems really are. For instance, we cannot spend in the world what we are now spending on armaments and still abolish want; we the people, must make our minds up what we want and then see that our governments carry it out.

There is no 'wages during sickness' scheme in agriculture, and like all workers it is one of the things we most urgently need. We will only get it when it can be enforced by law through the Wages Board. To do this the government would have to amend the 1948 Agricultural Wages Act and we tried to get through a resolution asking our E.C. to make strong representation to the government to amend it. But the E.C. are reluctant to go to the Tory government for amending legislation, because they think it may then decide to amend the Act in ways which we do not want. So this resolution was lost, and negotiations are to continue with the National Farmers'

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Union to try and get wages whilst sick. We shall not get what we want this way; we need to be bold and firm and go to the government for amending legislation to enable us to negotiate wages during sickness through the Agricultural Wages Board, by enforceable law.

On international relations, Conference carried the following amended resolution:

> That this conference considers the worsening of international relations and the grave threat to world peace now existing to be the result of diplomacy based on nuclear war policies. It is futile to believe that peace can be preserved by the constant competition of nations for nuclear superiority. Peace will only be assured when all armaments are abolished and thus the basis for spying and provocation removed. The British, French and American governments should pursue a policy of international agreement for complete and general disarmament in agreed stages and with control and inspection.

There was a final sentence of this resolution, but it was deleted, which said the British government in the interim period 'should cease to manufacture and renounce the use of all nuclear weapons and prohibit the use of British soil or water for use as bases for such weapons'.

Conference then went on to carry a resolution against the training of German troops in Britain and opposing all foreign bases in our country. This resolution was carried with a majority of 38. When the issues were put simply and plainly to conference, in as few words as possible, it was not then possible to confuse delegates with a play on words by cold war propaganda. My union is now committed therefore to opposing the training of German troops here, and all foreign bases, in practical terms this is a vote against Nato.

The battle for a progressive policy will go forward on all fronts, not on the basis of attacking individuals, but of attacking policies and arguing for better alternatives. This I am sure is the way to make our union strong, this is the way forward to peace and socialism. Sometimes it may seem a long uphill battle, but it is a battle which is being won, and must be if Britain is to survive.

2. THE SCOTTISH T.U.C.

An English Delegate

THERE were many points of special interest to me, my first time as a delegate to Scotland. I am more accustomed to the British Trades Union Congress, whose proceedings have been so much dominated of recent years by dictation from the platform, horse-trading between leaders of power blocks, jugglery in Standing

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Orders, off-stage battles in delegations and the block vote often manipulated against democracy and to conceal minority opinion.

Here at the 65th Scottish T.U.C. held in 'the granite city' of Aberdeen, you are first struck by the more democratic forms still surviving. No block votes (though this year Congress took a step backward here and changed the rule for the future); individual decisions (if you have the fare your branch can send three delegates, each of whose vote counts) and trades council representation. But the characteristic of the S.T.U.C. is not just its more democratic form, but also its reflection of an older craft type; trades council delegates are themselves generally working craft workers—shipyard workers, electricians, pattern-makers, engineers—as distinct from the south, where they are often white-collared and bound in by the outlook and control of Congress House minions. An appeal can still be made to working class solidarity and applauded! Of course, where labour is established safely, no doubt there will be the political corruption found all too often further south also. But the whole thing is more like the British T.U.C. of twenty years or so ago. This of course reflects the slower over-all development of Scotland: in spite of a fringe (U.S. subsidiaries, branches of U.K. trusts) of new techniques, the weight is still ship-building, heavy engineering, coal, etc.

Then again, to me the growing national outlook in Scotland—in the Scottish working-class movement—is also noteworthy. The attitude of the leadership in ruling that Scottish questions were not to be discussed at the Scottish Labour Party Conference, and the furious resentment of the rank and file in Scotland, show this.

But Scotland is not only a large place: it controls a lot of votes—in the House of Commons and in trade union and Labour Party delegations nationally. Hence, I think, the presence of so many of the trade union Top Brass this year. I counted no less than eighteen general secretaries or presidents of unions, from extreme left to Sydney Greene, and on beyond to the ultra Carron. In between there was Frank Cousins and a number of Confederation unions' officers.

Of course you can notice corrupting influences at work here as elsewhere. But the process is much more like the days of Jimmy Thomas and even Bevin than the smoother one of modern London suburbs. But unless something a good deal stronger than smooth words, petty opportunities and a militant sounding policy is offered, the old radicalism may well assert itself.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I was impressed by the lively delegates from what seemed vigorous trades councils (29 such bodies), as well as those from no less than 79 unions, 500 delegates in all; some 785,000 people are in organisations affiliated to the S.T.U.C.—more than double the number in 1938. Here I am writing just a Sassenach's first impressions; I do not dwell on Congress decisions, which have all been recorded, but it is worth noting what questions dominated proceedings. These were the general debate on unemployment and Scotland's economy; the need to stop pit and railway closures before these nationalised industries were totally wrecked; and for government direction of industry to Scotland. There were also the resolutions about shipbuilding and the need to nationalise it; the complete rejection of pay pause; opposition to the common market; and some strong resolutions on the international situation which made Mr. Frank Cousins beam.

3. THE ENGINEERS

A Delegate

A FEATURE of the 1962 National Committee of the Amalgamated Engineering Union has been the struggle for power being carried out between the Executive on the one hand, and the rank and file policy-making body of 52 delegates on the other. The National Committee met at a time when the result of the national ballot on wages was declared. Most of the delegates were severely critical of the way in which the wages claim had been pursued, and only a few delegates could be found to approve of the officials calling a ballot on whether to strike or not. Most considered that a militant lead should have been given by the Executive at once as a follow-on to the magnificent response to the one-day strikes of February and March. Last year we had stipulated that the National Committee should be recalled three months after the date of the application, if no settlement had been reached. Although the rules state that 'all decisions of the National Committee shall be final and binding on the E.C.', this instruction had been ignored. What is more, the President, Brother W. Carron, blandly stated that they intended to continue to ignore instructions on recalls in future, if it suited their purposes, claiming that the rules merely meant that it was the duty of the Executive to decide whether to recall the National Committee. Then the delegates threw down the gauntlet by instructing the Executive not to accept a settlement of the present claim until it has been considered by a recalled National Committee. They also decided on another recall to consider a further advance in wages in 1962.

Many delegates were of the opinion that the Executive are doing their best to reduce the policy-making National Committee to a mere advisory body. This will be resisted

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by all who are proud of the democratic constitution of the union.

The issue on defence and foreign policy, as last year, resolved itself into a battle of tactics between the right and the left, in which the real issue was lost sight of. The scales were heavily weighted in favour of the Right because of their control of the standing orders committee. As a result they were able to give precedence to a resolution asking for a 'flexible policy' capable of uniting the whole of the Labour Party.

The debate on the Common Market proved to be the highlight of the meeting; and despite desperate pleas by Carron and the chairman of standing orders, the resolution registering complete opposition to Britain's entry was only defeated by 27 votes to 25. The measure of the power of the Left can be gauged by the fact that the successful amendment was qualified by a whole list of conditions which would never be accepted by other Common Market countries.

On the German question, a very good resolution was passed calling for the recognition of the German Democratic Republic, that Berlin be a free city, and that a nuclear weapon-free area should be set up.

As always, the issue of full employment was an important one, with Executive and rank and file battling out how to deal with redundancy. The rank and file insisted that the abolition of overtime and the establishment of a shorter working week was the answer to the problem. Grave concern was expressed by the shipbuilding delegates about the lack of orders for new ships, and the Executive was instructed to insist that shipowners who receive an investment allowance from the government for building new ships should be forced to build them in Britain.

Summing up, despite right-wing control of the union, the National Committee expressed the desire of the union's million members for better wages, better conditions, and for security and peace. When this right-wing control is broken and delegates can legislate without reactionary opposition, there will be a rapid advance towards the establishment of a Socialist Britain.

Education

Education will not cure people of the grossest social selfishness and tyranny unless Socialistic principles for part of it. . . . This stirring up is part of the necessary education which must in good truth go before the reconstruction of society: but I repeat that without laying before people this reconstruction, our education will but breed tyrants and cowards, big, little and least, down to the smallest who can screw out money from standing by to see another man working for him.

(William Morris, Letter to Mrs. Burne-Jones, September, 1883.)

Classified Advertisements

(3s. 6d. a line, minimum, 10s. 6d. Cash with order to : 'Class Ads.', Labour Monthly, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.)

DUPLICATING, Verbatim Shorthand, Typing (tapes, etc.), Translating. Mabel Eyles, 10, Beaconsfield Road, London, N.11. ENT 3324.

VETERAN L.M. readers: your early copies and pamphlets may be invaluable to others. Send details to: L.M. Exchange Service, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.

WE BUY books pamphlets: Socialism, U.S.S.R., Comintern, Spain. We collect: RIV 6807. The Hammersmith Bookshop, Beadon Road, W.6.

URGENTLY REQUIRED—All back numbers of *Labour Monthly* from 1921-1930 inclusive and 1939.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Yankeefaction of England

THESE UNITED STATES

R. Page Arnot

FIVE weeks ago, Prime Minister Macmillan was on his way back from Washington. It was the fifth time in fifteen months that the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom had danced attendance on the President of the United States. Has there ever been anything like it in peace time? It is true that in old dynastic China it was customary for the Emperor graciously to receive emissaries, 'tribute-bearing Outer Tribesmen'; and it is also true that China then was the greatest of all the feudal powers of the world as the U.S.A. is now by far the greatest of all the capitalist countries. But the parallel is not exact. For one thing Harold Macmillan was not expected to kneel down and knock his forehead thrice upon the floor ('the kow-tow'); for another, the tribesmen approaching the Ming throne were not from countries with Ming armies of occupation, nor did the Outer chiefs themselves in person make the journey to the Gate of Celestial Peace.

No, we have travelled far from the feudal world. Capitalist civilisation has refined upon these customs and has also enlarged their scope. No-one today performs the kow-tow bodily. Instead of this gross corporeal symbol of subservience, the kow-tow has been transformed into a spiritual posture. This spiritual kow-tow, this refined gesture of the soul, is now performed nightly by crowds of journalists in the newspaper offices. It is performed in the radio studios, in the counting houses and above all in the legislatures—even if not every Member of Parliament would follow the discount banker Lord Brand who urged the Peers 'to be more deferential towards the United States'.

But now there comes in a further refinement. It would be insulting to the self-respect of a considerable number of these devotees, so we are told, if they were to find themselves treating as right-worshipful the actual Yankee bosses, or if they could see themselves (as others see them) bowing down to the Almighty Dollar. So they insist on portraying an imaginary U.S. Government, and imaginary U.S. ruling class of beneficent billionaires; and it is before this image, the product of their own imagination, that the nymphs and satyrs of Fleet Street dance and perform the kow-tow. So too, with the politicians and the discount bankers and the television phantoms.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Every now and again there is some awkward event such as the U.S. Maritime Board's behaviour to the eight British shipping lines: and this leads to some grumbles and petulant words in Parliament. But soon the steam is blown off; and the imaginary United States is once more dominant in the mind's eye.

Yet it is known that the U.S.A. is the most intensely capitalist of all the capitalist countries. It is as the Minister of Transport called it in Parliament on May 8, 'the bastion of free enterprise': *Free Enterprise* being the pet name the capitalists give to their own activities. For a century the U.S.A. has been nothing but capitalist, naked capitalism without any admixture of previous feudalism, capitalism 'pure and uncontaminated'. All the classic features are there, as though compounded from a formula. You might almost think that the Red Indians had been exterminated and their lands occupied in order to demonstrate axioms of political economy as propounded by Adam Smith and his successors.

The seamy side of *Free Enterprise,* it is equally well-known, is exploitation of man by man: the ranging of society to two opposite camps of exploiters and exploited. This too the history of the United States has provided and also in a superlative degree, while in particular districts the violence of class struggle outdid all examples in this country. *Free Enterprise* recruited the Pinkertons, the licensed thugs used against the early trade unions of the U.S.A.

How is it that these United States have become so different from the promise of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century that was hailed by Robert Burns, and William Cobbett and Shelley? How from being politically the most advanced of all nations, has it now sunk to the rear and become the protector of every petty corrupt and tyrannical régime in the world? The answer is clearly written.

The defeat of the rebellious slave-holders and the end of slavery in the Civil War of 1861-1865 was at the same time a new beginning. In the new era then begun the rising plutocracy met the effective beginnings of trade unions and working-class organisation with every weapon of *Free Enterprise*: and, even as capitalism extended, with a more and more numerous proletariat, so there developed within it far reaching changes. It was in 1859 that deep drilling for oil brought in the first barrels of petroleum and, only eleven years later John D. Rockefeller soon to become the richest individual on earth, formed his oil company, forerunner of the Standard Oil Trust. This first modern monopoly, hatched out of free enterprise by an inevitable process (aided of course by corrupt practices) was soon followed by

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

others, and to such an extent in the next fifty years that the alarmed small capitalists again in the name of *Free Enterprise* passed the Sherman anti-trust laws of 1911. But vain were their hopes to call back the years that the locust had eaten. Monopoly sprang from its couch of oil in the Pennsylvanian Mountains and spreadeagled first over these United States, and then over still wider tracts. The growth and tyranny of monopoly is the last half-century's history.

Being so nearly classic capitalism the swollen growth of the U.S.A. has been very much as predicted by the founders of scientific socialism. It has exploited the working class, piled up immense accumulations of commodities, and from the surplus value filched out of each producer has piled up the largest surplus of capital ever known. Profit and then super-profit from each less developed country piled it ever higher, till the skyscrapers of its city centres became symbolic of the towering trusts that dominated its economy. Markets had to be found for this immense surplus, so that the profits on it might become even more immense, markets overseas.

'Export capital or die of congestion' is the modern law of production for profit. Here is the mainspring of the foreign policy of the U.S.A. The State Department, once merely the sub-office and public relations bureau of Standard Oil and Pierpoint Morgan, has become the organ of all U.S. monopoly capital.

The State Department and the U.S. marines, once limited to meddling and making war in first 'the Banana Republics' and then over the whole of the states of Latin America have now gone further afield. The Yankee heirship to the old Vice-royalties of Spain was proclaimed in April, 1917, when the United States entering into the first World War was accompanied by a retinue of twenty-two States of Latin America. But now the State Department Secretary Rusk holds his Anzus meeting (from which Lord Home and Macmillan are excluded) in early May in Australia. By mid-May the Seato Pact button is pressed and ten thousand U.S. marines are let loose on Indo-China.

Every nook of every continent is searched out. Markets for goods, and then markets for capital, markets of consumption and then markets of destruction. War is a marvellous market for them while it lasts. War preparation is nearly as enriching in profits per annum and lasts longer. The military and the marines become part of Big Business: big business becomes part of the Army and Navy. The Pentagon, with a dowry of war markets is wed to Wall Street.

In 1861 the Civil War began; in 1863 the slaves were set free; in

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1865 the surrender of General Lee at Appomattox Court House ended the war. Henceforth capitalism, free enterprise with its free labourers would have no rival within the U.S.A. Now observe the economic law of motion of this free enterprise society. In a hundred years free competition has been turned into its opposite, monopoly; the free market into rings for price rigging; democracy into plutocracy; free elections into the gross deception of the two-party system; the rights of man into the denial of rights; the defenders of life and liberty into the merchants of death; the pursuit of happiness into the pursuit by McCarthyites; Appomattox into Little Rock, Arkansaw.

But, in a capitalist society, monopoly has not only its distinctive economic features but also possesses another title and designation, namely *imperialism*. Yankee imperialism, with its financiers and tycoons of Big Business, with its export of capital, with world-wide trusts and its claws on every continent, exceeds all that has gone before. The Yankee imperialists are making a bid to out-do all their rivals in militarism and aggression, in corruption and tyranny. Small wonder if men and women recoil in horror when they catch sight of this picture of Dorian Gray, the true visage of Uncle Sam.

No picture, however, is wholly black: and not all is evil in these United States. There is another U.S.A., not the 'land of the free' that has vanished into the limbo of times past, but a U.S.A. of the present: men and women who stand for all the exploited against the exploiters, men and women who are the vanguard of the working class. They champion the rights of the oppressed Negro and of the subject nations. They are the voice that cries 'Disarm!', and calls aloud for an end to nuclear weapons and for the establishment of permanent peace.

To stifle that voice, the Yankee bosses will stick at nothing. To break that resistance, the core of which is the Communist Party of the United States, they will go to any lengths.

All the engines of oppression, all the legislative bull-dozers for destroying civil liberties that came into action earlier are now exceeded. The United States Congress, with its House of Representatives (representing the rich) and its Upper House (composed of millionaire Senators and Senators who are regarded by the Trusts as reliable) has been for many years a stumbling-block to human progress and to civil liberty.

The Un-American Activities Committee, the obscene activities of Senator McCarthy, gained for the U.S. Senate the sort of ill-fame

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that history has attached to the Star Chamber or the Spanish Inquisition.

The legislative as apart from the inquisitory activities of Congress have gone further still. As engines for the persecution of Communists (and of all other democrats later) they constructed and passed into law the Smith Act of 1940 and the McCarran Act of 1950. These, perhaps the most extreme forms of suppression ever devised in the U.S. anti-democratic conspiracy, are now brought fully into play with the complicity last year of the U.S. Supreme Court: and another millionaire, President Kennedy's 'brother Bob', —by nepotism made U.S. Attorney-General—is now busy on this persecution. The wording of these Acts, given in a little detail in the January issue of this magazine* are offensive to the most elementary sense of justice or fair dealing.

Even *The Times* professed itself appalled by the decision of the Supreme Court and the behaviour of the Kennedy (Tweedledee) administration. But many inside the U.S.A. (where it requires courage) went further than *The Times*. A sense of admiration at the unremitting struggle of the Communists for democracy against the Smith and McCarran Acts moved them. For example one of the Communist leaders, Gus Hall, has been given opportunity to speak at a series of universities: and, according to one account

> A by-product of all this was the American Association of University Professors gave its annual Alexander Meiklejohn Award to Arthur Fleming, president of the University of Oregon, for upholding the right of Gus Hall to speak to an audience of 12,000 in the football field.†

We too in Britain share this sense of admiration and with it are moved to protest at the persecution—as did the Executive Committee of the National Union of Railwaymen on May 17. Indeed the whole world is with them in their struggle. They represent the best traditions of the U.S.A. The true heirs of 1776 and 1863, of President Jefferson and President Lincoln are these Communists—these and not the degenerate millionaires who now dominate and persecute. When in Britain we proclaim our solidarity with these persecuted men and women, we are taking part in a joint struggle along with them. Whoever is against subservience, whoever wants to end the kow-tow, must know that it is a joint struggle against the Yankee bosses for liberty and independence—their and ours.

---

*The U.S. Conspiracy by William Gallacher.

†John Williamson in *The Daily Worker* of May 21, 1962.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CUBA TRAVEL NOTES:

4. Education

D. N. Pritt, Q.C.

January 8: Visited the Ministry of Education, and had a long interview with the Deputy Minister. The Ministry occupies a few of the many buildings in what was formerly a huge military fortress covering a square mile of land. It was a sort of Aldershot on the edge of Havana. Before the revolution it was handy to supply troops to overawe the population of the capital at short notice, to station and to train troops, and to provide safety for ministers—Batista had a residence there. After the revolution it was turned into a great educational centre, under the name of Liberty City (Ciudad Libertad).

The former barracks have been altered into attractive educational buildings—schools, theatre, libraries, hostel for residential students, etc. Most of the schools are primary schools for local children, but there are a number of residential secondary schools (there were a number of similar 'Aldershots' in other large towns on the island, which have all been turned into educational 'Liberty Cities'). In the talks with the Deputy Minister, we happened first to get on to illiteracy. The year just passed, 1961, had been devoted to wiping out illiteracy. It was a very big task for they wanted to do it fully, in the one year, and they had 1,100,000 illiterates in a population of just over six million, many of whom were in rural areas with sparse populations. They began by setting up commissions to plan the campaign, and turned largely to the mass organisations for voluntary helpers. The work involved planning of the actual work (which is very different from ordinary schoolteaching) and they showed us admirable books that had been prepared for teaching the illiterates (*and* for teaching the teachers to teach).

The work was not too difficult in towns, for when they had their teachers ready the illiterates could attend classes in the evenings; but in the country they had to go about it in the way China had tackled the task of persuading 500,000,000 peasants that they really could, and must, get rid of the landlords who had previously ruled them. They sent 'brigaders' (Brigadistas) to live in the peasants' houses and share in the peasants' work, and then give their lessons in the evenings (often grouping three or four households in one).

By the last four months (when actual results would be really coming to a head) they had 104,000 miscellaneous teachers at work,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many of whom were senior secondary school students volunteering to give up many months to arduous whole time work, often at great risk; a few of them were murdered by counter-revolutionaries, either because they came across counter-revolutionary activity or because education is after all very bad for counter-revolution. They have been rewarded by the title of 'Brigadista', and by various special facilities for catching up with their education. When we were there, just after 1961 had ended, the Brigadistas had come back to the cities almost like a demobilised army. Flats and houses were putting up notices: 'We are lodging a brigadista', and in Liberty City they were arriving every day in masses, to occupy the newly converted hostels and complete their own education in the new residential secondary schools.

Three hundred thousand people in all took part in the illiteracy work over the year. And when the work was over the still illiterate constituted 3·9 per cent of the total population, classed as the very old; the mentally weak or blind and deaf; foreigners, not speaking Spanish. I noticed that they did not even mention the Playa Giron invasion as having interrupted or slowed up the illiteracy work.

It is not surprising that one sees advertisements everywhere proclaiming that Cuba is the only country in all America that is free of illiteracy.

We then turned to education generally. Primary education starts at the age of six. In 1958, eight hundred thousand children of primary school age—about 50 per cent of them all—did not go to school, because there were not enough schools. After the revolution, they built schools for the 'eight hundred thousand' so that they now have twice what they had, and enough: sometimes the schools are no more than rooms in peasants' houses.

This programme calls for fifteen hundred new teachers (and thus they *solve* illiteracy permanently, for 1961 has dealt with the existing illiterates, and this education protects them from any new ones.)

They have a shortage of teachers, but plan to make up the fifteen hundred (and others) by drawing on a pool of 'unemployed' teachers, seven thousand in all—people who had been trained before the revolution but got no posts because there were not the schools for them; they have gone to other work, but most of them can be got back. They have in addition, groups of volunteer teachers for distant places; they collected these by appealing to all youth in the second stage of secondary school to volunteer. The response was great; they established schools to train them in the Sierra Maestra (see below), where they lived with the peasants.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As to secondary education, there is really a new type of school and of teacher. Before the revolution a very low percentage of children went to secondary schools, which were only to be found in the large towns, and were very expensive—even those which were *state* schools—especially as students would have to pay for lodging unless their families lived in the town. Now even the smallest town has a secondary school, and there are many 'rural secondary basics'.

Secondary schools are divided into 'secondary basic', giving a three-year course from about twelve years to about fifteen, and 'pre-university' and one or two other varieties of school institutes from fifteen to eighteen years. The intention is that *all* children should have at least 'secondary basic', which aims at

(1) a complete general education.

(2) practical factory work as well as schooling, to discover the real vocation of the child. (This includes metal, electricity, etc., and also the arts, music, chemistry, physics, etc.)

(3) to raise the general appreciation of manual work, and get rid of the traditional conflict between workers by hand and workers by brain.

After the first of the two stages of secondary, one can go on to a school for primary teachers, to an institute of administration or of fine arts, or to a 'pre-university institute'.

January 15: Visited the famous 'Camillo Cienfuegos School City' (Ciudad escolar), named after one of the heroes of the revolution. It lies at the foot of the Sierra Maestra, some distance from Santiago de Cuba on what was a huge cattle ranch covering nearly 35 square miles. When it is finished, it will be an immense residential school.

The Sierra Maestra, which I mentioned last month as a great hearth of the revolution, is about 135 miles long and 25 miles wide. It is inhabited by 73,000 families—280,000 individuals, 58,000 children of school age. In less than two years, the revolution established 1,700 primary schools in addition to what were already there; all are still working. Often there is only one schoolroom, and at times the 'schoolroom' will be no more than a big room in a peasant's home, for distances are great, the population dispersed, and communications difficult. (They have also built 37 rural hospitals which have since largely been amalgamated, so that six are now working. It has also put in roads 'as many as the topography permits' and has also established as many co-operative farms and *granjas* (State farms) as possible, growing especially coffee, cocoa and timber.)

The leaders of the revolution, who one way and another spent many years in the sierra, saw its misery and backwardness and thus

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

did all they could, as I have just mentioned, to improve the situation; but they concluded that a great centralised school city was needed.

The school is planned to hold in the end 20,000 children, boarding at the school and going home twice a year for 15 days each time. The task of building this tremendous 'colony' was and is put on to the 'liberation army'—the 'regular army' core of the country—relatively small, for the general defence of the country is entrusted to the workers' and peasants' army, of something like 900,000 milicianos. (The army was apparently selected for its efficiency, morale, and discipline, for the problems of both building and administration are great.) The expense of construction is expected to be pretty heavy but when it is once built it will be self-supporting. As the army has the responsibility, it has set up a 'comandancia' (command) nearby; 6,000 army men are actually at work at present, with a good number of civilian technicians.

Whilst the army is in complete charge of the work of construction, and also of the administration of the small part of the school colony that is already at work, there is nothing military about the dealing with the children; and the army's autonomy is not complete because the Ministries of Education and of Public Works and to a small extent two other Ministries 'poke their noses in!' As a sample of this 'mixture' of authorities, I was told that the army appoints only one head teacher, and he has 24 civilian teachers under him for each 'unit' (see below). The military hope to finish the construction in two to three years and will then move out.

I think the construction so far has lagged a bit, for the Commandant said that it would take 40 years to build if they followed the original lines. This meant, I think, that they had taken a year to build one unit and as forty are needed if each unit takes 500 children and they are planning for 20,000, this means 40 years. The units will be something like the 'houses' in some British schools, independent and complete organisations of teaching and boarding establishments, with their own teachers, class-rooms, hostels, refectories, culture and leisure installations, etc. There is one complete unit—actually of 572—fully functioning. To hasten construction, they are now busily building a number of units simultaneously, series-wise and with much pre-fabrication.

The selection of children—at present only boys, for there is only one unit—is not yet 'typical'; in the end it is proposed to take children of both sexes, mainly on the basis of good qualifications, but for the moment the boys are coming on selection as 'war-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

victims' which really means 'suffering unduly, in one way or another, from the war conditions that have prevailed'.

The education will run all through the range from primary to the second (last) stage of secondary education; and the general idea is, that when they have finished, they will go back home, save for specially brilliant ones that might go to some other skilled training or to the university. The city is not designed to 'transplant' children, but merely to give them a better education than would otherwise be possible in view of the remoteness of many parts of the Sierra, and the war conditions, which hit many of them especially hard. Even so, it can be guessed—and rightly—that there has been opposition from parents, much stimulated by counter-revolutionary stories such as:

(1) it's really not a school, but a Soviet submarine base (and this although it is some miles from the sea!).

(2) it's really a rocket-launching base!

(3) it is really a recruiting point for the collection of children, who will be sent to U.S.S.R.

(4) it's going to be bombed on such and such a day of such and such a month.

To overcome this reluctance, whether natural or stimulated, the school invites relatives to come and stay for a while, often at some expense to the school.

The actual teaching has and will have an agricultural tendency on the top of general education; they work 5½ hours a week on the land. They are—and will be—able to produce all they need. The discipline is largely run by the children themselves. The children all join a co-operative which in effect runs their lives. Coercion and correction (punishment) cannot be applied by teachers or by the administration; only the co-operative itself can deal with infractions, by stopping you seeing television or playing chess or sports or form work or excursions; but there can be no deprivation of freedom. ('If I find a child on the roof' said the commandant, 'I must not shout to him to come down, but must send for the co-operative official on duty to deal with the matter!') The children do all the work of running the school, except laundry and cooking.

The whole thing seemed to me, both in conception and execution, a great and imaginative step forward; whether it will be thought necessary or useful in other areas it is still too early to judge.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS

Education and the Working Class

Brian Jackson and Dennis Marsden

Routledge & Kegan Paul. 268 pp. 25s.

THIS is an extremely interesting book. The two authors themselves come from working class families in a Yorkshire town, having passed the 11 plus and reached the university. They have made a careful, qualitative study of the actual effect of grammar school education on a sample of 88 working class children from the same town. These children were in their final year in the grammar school between 1949 and 1952—and are now in their late twenties or early thirties. Their method comprised interviews with their parents and with the 'children' themselves, and a sample of 10 middle class children and parents too.

What emerges from this study? Facts derived from various investigations during the last ten years have shown that, in spite of the 1944 Education Act, the working class is still very under-represented in the grammar schools—the 11 plus is weighted in favour of middle class children. Further, working class children tend to leave grammar school early—at 15 or 16, often alienated by the middle class character and ethos of these schools. But the children studied here are those who stayed on, who took their 'A' level examinations, and in many cases went on to universities and training colleges.

The authors bring out very clearly what this means for the ordinary working class child. For the vast majority it meant, by the end of the process, full 'accommodation' to the middle class values which pervade these schools, the development of docility and orthodoxy, new manners, new friends, new accents, the deliberate acceptance of the school as compared with the neighbourhood, separation from working class life and working class friends. Although many had experienced moments of stress in this transformation, 'most grew through this and accepted both the way in which they had been trained, and the world for which they were being prepared. They were now middle class citizens'.

Analysis of their attitudes and opinions shows that this upward social mobility (46 of the 88 became teachers, others went into industry or became doctors, ministers, etc.) was accompanied by a narrow orthodoxy, a movement towards right-wing politics (especially conservatism), a somewhat arid cultural outlook, and a breakdown of communication with their working class parents. Nearly all firmly believed in the absolute justice of the 11 plus examination and the absolute value of a grammar school education. Most of the sample has developed into 'stable, often rigidly orthodox citizens, who wish to preserve a hierarchical society and all its institutions as they now stand'. Most of them wish to forget their working class background.

This pattern was derived from study of only a very small sample and the authors are, of course, well aware of this limitation. But important social and cultural questions are raised which they attempt to answer. The key question, as they see it, is 'how to open education for the working class'? This, they hold, involves the end of the grammar school—inevitably dominated by a middle class ethos—and the end of all attempts to select children early and rear an elite. Instead an 'open' system of education should be created

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

based on the full acceptance of the comprehensive school. But in particular they look forward to the development of a 'national' or classless culture in which schools and colleges would be 'rooted'—a culture to which 'the best values of working class living' would have much to contribute. 'A huge amount would be achieved by shared schooling in a "national" society, and the way to rich progress at last opened'.

Our society is, of course, a hierarchical 'class' society and the way to social unity and a classless culture cannot be found through education change alone—these ideals can only be realised through fundamental social change involving the abolition of capitalism, and so of the economic basis of class differentiation. But if the conclusion of this book is utopian, this does not detract from its value as a social document. The book casts a flood of light on the actual working of an important part of the educational system—the 'declassing' of the working class child in the grammar school and his moulding for a new function in a class society. It is extremely readable—has, in fact, become a best seller, widely discussed in the press. The authors are to be congratulated on their initiative, especially the ingenious planning of their investigation.

BRIAN SIMON.

An Atlas of African Affairs

A. Boyd and P. van Rensburg

Methuen. 134 pp. 8s. 6d.

IT IS hardly surprising that good, up-to-date maps of Africa are scarce or even unobtainable since the continent is changing so rapidly. The idea of producing *An Atlas of African Affairs* is an excellent one and this little book contains a number of fascinating maps and a great deal of useful information.

It is divided into two sections. The first section contains seventeen maps dealing with such general questions as population, languages and peoples, education, transport, minerals and some historical questions. The second section with thirty-eight maps, deals with regional groups and individual territories.

The authors take a liberal rather than a sharply anti-imperialist standpoint and there are many statements that a Marxist would not agree with. For instance, in the section on Pan-Africanism emphasis is put on regional groupings like Pafmeca (Pan-African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa) now incidentally extended to include South Africa, rather than on wider associations (page 34). The section on Ghana tends to damn with faint praise—its prestige is due to the fact that it attained independence *first*, it has curbed opposition in a way 'which has been widely criticised', its hopes of development are pinned on the ambitious Volta project 'not yet assured of foreign finance' (page 84). The section on the Congo is weak and the authors absolve the United Nations of responsibility for the murder of Lumumba (page 93). Katanga is dealt with separately on page 110, with Northern Rhodesia.

Thus because of weaknesses in the political outlook of the authors, this book, while shedding a good deal of light on the situation in Africa will also spread some mistaken ideas.

KAY BEAUCHAMP.

Published by the proprietors, The Trinity Trust, 134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3, and printed by Wembley News, Wembley, Middlesex, Great Britain. Registered for transmission by Magazine Post to Canada, including Newfoundland.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(Continued from page ii of cover)

convinced that the British people have it in their power to win a peaceful future for themselves.'

One of the first things any one who has just plunged into activity learns is that he or she at once has to find answers to questions they have never asked themselves before. Everything seems to need looking at anew. New people coming into activity must be given the best guide to action—or we may lose them. How many readers are making certain *now*—not next month or some time 'after this campaign's over, when we are following up'—that *Labour Monthly* is being made available to the new people? Take R.P.D.'s April Notes which so many praised entitled *Problems of Disarmament*. Here you had the lot: in whose interest is it to maintain war tension, why socialism neither wants it nor needs it—and why monopoly capitalism does; the reason for the different position on testing, control and inspection; who has the defensive and who the offensive nuclear strategy, and *why* the bomb is not the same in different hands—and, indeed, why Soviet tests are not the same as U.S. tests? Those Notes appeared two months ago; has everyone you know studied them closely and so got all these very complex questions clear? New people need L.M.; and L.M. needs new readers—fast; the time left for influencing events may be short. The link between the two is—you!

I am beginning to feel anxious about the fund, which is not in a healthy condition. There is not the proper increase in the number of regular guarantors so that the faithful old friends are carrying too much: half the whole fund is contributed by three: 'in memory of Cyril Moss', Daisy Bell and 'Windfall' (I wish I could tell the story behind this last, by the way!). If you cannot contribute yourself, or cannot contribute more than you do, can you organise other people to express their appreciation of the quality of the magazine by a collection? They may be only waiting the word: you may be surprised, like this *North West Midlands* reader: 'After reading I pass my copy to a friend who is inclined to the Left. Last night he came along and gave me a pound note to hand over to you. Here it is. I think he is much influenced by L.M.—but what intelligent person would not be?' What, indeed—and there are plenty about! DONATIONS received during April totalled:

£61 13s. 4d.

REGULAR DONATIONS came from: E. Strachan Rogers, £2 2s; 'Backslider', £1; Marie Philibert, 10s; 'Daisy Bell', £10; 'In Memory of Cyril Moss', £10; 'Windfall', £10; 'In Memory of Joe Brien', 5s; 'Anon', Whitchurch, 1s; B. W. Mackay, 3s 6d; S. Turner (for Daisy Mendez, Cuba), 10s; K. Forge, 10s; M. Illing, 10s; R.F.B., £3; L. Perkins, 2s 6d; D. H. Strathern and Friends, 10s; L. Bates, 5s; Blackburn Branch, 1s 9d; Oldham Branch, 1s; H. Brindle, 10s; C.T.H., £2; L'Humanite, 4s; 'Oliver Twist and Friends', 15s; R. Dodd, £1; J. A. Smith, 6s; R. McLeod, 5s; G. C. Fitt, 1s 6d; S. Morrissy, 10s; F.G.A. (Canada), 10s; Socialist Sailor, £1; E.J.B., 10s; J. A. Purton, 7s 6d; A.M.T. for Fernando and Guilherme, Portugal, 1s.

OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS include: E. E. Cripps, £1 2s; Miss M. R. Mann, 6s; F. A. Farrow, 2s; Finchley C.N.D., 7s 6d; K. B. Kay, 2s; A. Jordan, 6s 3d; Pat Barrass, 5s; S. Datta, 2s; D. R. Morrison, 11s; R. N. Baker, 12s; D. M. Adams, 3s; J. R. Smith, 5s; F. H. Bird, £1 2s; H. Kirtlan, 2s; S. Jones, 12s; J. Hill (per Prendergast), £1; A.B.D. (Canada), 6s 11d; J.B. (Canada), 6s 11d; Edith Walthall, £1 2s; R. Herring, 3s; 'In Memory of John Mackay of Peebles', 10s; J. Berger, 10s; A.S. (Canada), £1 10s; D. H. Calcutt, 12s; B. Lewis, 10s; M. Paton, 12s; H.J.P. (U.S.A.), 15s; Dora's Donation, 6s.

Our thanks to you all.
Co-op. No. L.99482.

ANGELA TUCKETT,
134, Ballards Lane, London, N.3.
FINchley 5135.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To All Trade Unionists

This month we have articles for:

MINERS (Bill Paynter)
MOTOR WORKERS (Peter Nicholas)
ENGINEERS (R. Etheridge)
and delegates' reports from:
The N.U.A.W. Conference
The A.E.U. National Committee
The Scottish T.U.C.

Each month we have something of interest to trade unionists generally, in our series "Problems of Trade Unionism in the Sixties." (Full commentary, too, on current peace problems, international affairs, the socialist world and former colonies.)

HELP US TO GET THIS SERIES WIDELY KNOWN

1. Show this copy to your mates and fellow trade unionists.
2. Get your branch or shop stewards' committee to order copies.

Reduced rates for trade unions and shop stewards' committees during this series: 1s. 6d. each, 7s. 6d. for 6; 1s. 3d. per extra copy.

I enclose .....s. .....d. for ..... copies.

WHY NOT BY POST?

NAME .....
(Please use block capitals)

ADDRESS .....

.....

.....

I enclose 18s. (if by wrapper, or £1 if by envelope), for year's subscription from the..... issue.

(SIGNED) .....

To LABOUR MONTHLY
134, BALLARDS LANE, LONDON, N.3

Binder Bros. Ltd.
Building and decorating by craftsmen
STAmford Hill 4096

For all interested in the fight for Peace and Progress in the Countryside and the problems of Socialist Agriculture.
THE COUNTRY STANDARD
Quarterly 6d. By post 9d.
Annual Subscription 3/- Post free or
Send 3d. stamp for specimen copy.
THE COUNTRY STANDARD
27, Bedford St. Strand, London, W.C.2.

LABOUR RESEARCH
'Guiding Lights Doused'
'The Right to Strike'
'West German Boom Over'
1s. or 1s. 2½d. post free from
Labour Research Department
161, Drury Lane, London, W.C.2

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED